

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_125122
Title of the Manuscript:	Enhancing the productivity of Horse gram through demonstration of integrated crop management practices
Type of the Article	

#### **PART 1:** Review Comments

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript is delightful and significant indeed in the scientific community but there needs to expand it a lit bit by the author. I like the manuscript due to the prospective and wide range applications of the agriculture interventions.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title of the paper is ok but should be adjusted. I suggest that the title should be like this if possible: <b>Assessment and application of integrated crop management strategies to boost Horse gram's productivity.</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	There is no proper background information about the strategy and application of the concept and data collection method in the abstract, there is need for the author to introduce a brief concept, and how the data was collected, The aim of the manuscript should be included and should be clear and concise.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are in order, but there is need for the author to check and re-write the subsections again especially materials and methods section.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	The manuscript is scientifically and technically substantial.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The references are sufficient and recent, the author should add more up to date references. Some references are not cited in main text of the manuscript. APA style of references should be adopted.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The manuscript requires revision with respect to the language/English quality used for proper and scholarly communications. I therefore suggest that, the author ask a native English speaker or equivalent to assist him with correcting the spelling, grammar, word use, and punctuation throughout your manuscript.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Essentially, the technicality and content of this manuscript is well explained and is very vivacious, but there is needs for the author to improve the novelty of manuscript especially the methodology section.	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Usman Muhammad Tukur</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>School of Metallurgy and Environment, Central South University, China</b>